

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI
EASTERN DIVISION

JOHN DOE,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	Case No. 4:07CV00946 ERW
)	
CITY OF CREVE COEUR, MISSOURI, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

This matter comes before the Court on the Court's in camera review of documents. John Doe ("Plaintiff") has filed claims against the City of Creve Coeur (and others) alleging employment discrimination, and he also filed a civil rights lawsuit against St. Louis County (and others). These lawsuits were consolidated into the pending action.

Prior to filing these lawsuits, Plaintiff was involved in an action against an alleged sexual abuser. The City of Creve Coeur and St. Louis County (collectively, "Defendants") seek to discover information related to this prior litigation. Pursuant to the Court's Memorandum and Order dated February 27, 2009, Plaintiff submitted to the Court all documents related to his prior sexual abuse lawsuit, including: pleadings, all formal and informal documents that may be considered to be discovery documents, and all settlement documents.

Defendants have not provided the Court with many reasons for why they need this information.¹ Additionally, Defendants have not specified exactly what information they seek

¹ The Court has reviewed Defendants' First Motion to Compel Discovery, and in this Motion, Defendants merely assert that they will be prejudiced if his current claims mirror those requested in the previous litigation.

from the previous litigation.² Instead, they broadly ask that the Court order “Plaintiff to provide all information with respect to his sexual abuse case, save for the identity of the abuser.”

This request is overly broad, especially as Defendants are aware that the information they seek is subject to a confidentiality agreement. However, the Court has reviewed the documents submitted by Plaintiff. It appears to the Court that the disclosure of Plaintiff’s First Amended Petition³ would be appropriate.⁴ This document will provide Defendants with information on what damages Plaintiff sought in his prior lawsuit, resolving Defendants’ enumerated concern that Plaintiff’s current claims might mirror those claims from his previous lawsuit. Additionally, the name of the alleged sexual abuser was redacted from the First Amended Petition, resolving confidentiality concerns.

The confidentiality agreement provides a time period for affected parties to prevent or limit the disclosure of confidential information. Accordingly, Plaintiff shall not disclose the First Amended Petition until all notice requirements have been satisfied.

If Defendants feel that they require additional information related to Plaintiff’s previous lawsuit, they must provide the Court with a narrowly tailored request specifying what documents or information they require, and why they seek such discovery.

Accordingly,


² Defendants have not provided the Court with the questions they sought to ask at Plaintiff’s deposition.

³ Filed in the Circuit Court of the City of St. Louis on September 23, 2005.

⁴ The Court has examined the entire file thoroughly and notes that there is no information, in the Court’s judgment, that could be relevant to the issues in the present case that will not be produced.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiff shall disclose the First Amended Petition to Defendants. However, this document shall be disclosed only upon satisfying all notice requirements in the confidentiality agreement.

Dated this 9th Day of March, 2009.



E. RICHARD WEBBER
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE